



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 98th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 130

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 3, 1984

No. 55

Senate

SUPPORT FOR THE PRESIDENT'S ANTITERRORISM PROPOSALS

Mr. DENTON. Mr. President, I proudly join with my distinguished colleague from South Carolina, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, to introduce, on behalf of the administration, four bills to address the growing problem of terrorism.

Mr. President, we are seeing a disturbing and alarming trend in the use of terrorism. It is the direct use of terror by a number of sovereign foreign states. We have seen several examples of that state-sponsored and state-executed terrorism during just the past year: The bombing of our Embassies in Beirut and Kuwait, the bombing of the headquarters of the U.S. Marine peace-keeping unit in Beirut, and most recently the machinegun killing, by someone inside the Libyan Embassy in London, of a British policewoman and the wounding of 11 Libyans who were peacefully demonstrating against the Qadhafi regime. That act of terrorism was, according to recent press accounts, ordered by the Libyan Government.

In addition, state-provided training, financing, and logistical support for terrorists and terrorist groups is a profoundly serious and growing source of danger to the United States, and to our friends and allies abroad.

The legislative package proposed by the President complements and augments several pieces of antiterrorist legislation that I introduced earlier in this session: S. 2395, which would amend the Freedom of Information Act by providing an exemption for information relating to terrorism and foreign counterintelligence; S. 2469, the Anti-Terrorism Act of 1984, which would make terrorism a Federal crime and give the FBI primary investigative jurisdiction over the crime of terrorism; and S. 2470, the Anti-Nuclear Terrorism Act of 1984, which would give nuclear power reactor licensees access to the FBI's national criminal history files and thus enable licensees to check for criminal histories of potential employees who would have unes-

corted access to nuclear power facilities.

I want to outline the President's proposals:

ACT FOR THE PREVENTION AND PUNISHMENT OF THE CRIME OF HOSTAGE-TAKING

In September 1981, the President signed the instrument ratifying the International Convention Against the Taking of Hostages, which was adopted by the United Nations on December 17, 1979. The convention has not, however, been implemented domestically through enabling legislation. This bill would implement the 1979 convention by amending the Federal kidnaping statute to provide for Federal jurisdiction over any kidnaping in which a threat is made to kill, injure, or continue to detain a victim in order to compel a third party to do or to abstain from doing something. When the President signed the instrument of ratification, the Congress was informed that the instrument of ratification would not be deposited with the United Nations until enabling legislation had been enacted. To demonstrate to other governments and international organizations that the United States is serious about its efforts to deal with international terrorism, it is essential that the Congress approve the enabling legislation required for our full implementation of the Hostage-Taking Convention.

AIRCRAFT SABOTAGE ACT

The United States became a party in 1969 to the Tokyo Convention, which covers certain offenses or acts committed aboard aircraft, and in 1971 to the Hague Convention, which concerns the suppression of unlawful seizure of aircraft. The Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Civil Aviation was adopted at Montreal in 1971 and ratified by the United States in November 1972. It requires that all states party to it establish jurisdiction over certain offenses affecting the safety of civil aviation.

The Congress has approved enabling legislation for the first two conventions, but not for the Montreal Convention. In consequence, certain criminal acts related to aircraft sabotage or

hijacking are not adequately covered by U.S. law. The gap in the law sends a false signal to terrorists. It also indicates to other governments that we may not be as serious as we should be, and as in fact we are, in our efforts to combat international terrorism. Action by the Congress now would provide the basis for the long-overdue implementation of the Montreal Convention.

ACT FOR REWARDS FOR INFORMATION CONCERNING TERRORIST ACTS

Current law authorizes the payment of rewards for information concerning domestic crimes, but it is outdated. The maximum rewards are inadequate, and terrorism is not specifically included as a basis for paying a reward. Moreover, there is no authority for the payment of rewards for information about acts of terrorism abroad.

The proposed legislation, which is modeled on an existing statute that allows payment of rewards for information concerning the unauthorized manufacture of atomic weapons, recognizes that payment of a reward in connection with acts of domestic terrorism raises a matter of law enforcement that is properly within the jurisdiction of the Attorney General, but that the payment of a reward in connection with an act of terrorism abroad poses a political and foreign relations problem within the jurisdiction of the Secretary of State. By increasing the amounts of rewards that may be paid, and by authorizing rewards for information about terrorist acts committed abroad, the bill would markedly improve the ability of the Departments of Justice and State to obtain information leading to the freeing of hostages or the capture of the perpetrators of acts of terrorism. By passing this legislation, the Congress can further underscore the intent of the United States to take every appropriate and necessary step to protect its citizens and property from terrorist acts.

PROHIBITION AGAINST THE TRAINING AND SUPPORT OF TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS ACT OF 1984

The training and support of terrorist groups and activities by a number of countries has reached alarming proportions. In addition, the increase in the number of states now using terrorism as an instrument of foreign policy is highly disturbing. Activities by U.S. nationals to provide assistance to countries that support terrorism and use terrorism as a foreign policy tool has thus become a matter of grave concern to our national security. This bill, together with revised and strengthened regulations that the Department of State intends to issue

shortly, would enhance the ability of the Department of Justice to prosecute persons involved in the support of terrorist activities and of states using terrorism. Enactment of the legislation would be a strong contribution to the effort to combat terrorism.

The time has come, Mr. President, for the Congress to take forceful and effective measures against terrorism by passing the four legislative proposals as soon as humanly possible. In an effort to expedite that effort, the Subcommittee on Security and Terrorism, which I chair, has already scheduled a series of hearings on the bills. The first hearing will be held on June 5.

I believe it vital, Mr. President, that at those hearings we have a full and fair airing of the pros and cons of the legislation and make sure that we hear views from every responsible quarter. We certainly should not rush to judgment as the Washington Post did in its lead editorial on May 1 in which, without benefit of any hearings on the issues, it termed the President's package "Bad legislation" and an effort "to fight terrorism with hysteria."

One of the problems with the Washington Post editorial, Mr. President, is that it only addresses one of the four bills in the President's Legislative package—the Prohibition Against the Training or Support of Terrorist Organization Act of 1984. The Post editorial completely ignores the three other bills in the package, two of which are enabling legislation for treaties to which the United States is already a signatory.

Instead of hasty and ill-considered reactions, like those manifested by the Post, the country deserves a dispassionate, objective review of the President's proposals. An editorial that appeared on April 24 in the Florence Times Daily in my home State of Alabama reaches the heart of the problem that we face by pointing out that, like other terrorists, Colonel Qadhafi of Libya—

Must be taught that the more civilized nations of the world will not tolerate his militaristic tactics. His threats must be countered with adequate protections. His actions must be reprimanded. His use of Embassies to carry out intimidation of his exiles must stop. His lawlessness must end or at least be confined within the borders of Libya.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the Times Daily editorial, entitled "Get Tough With Libyans," be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

I believe it vital, Mr. President, that after full and fair hearings we move the bills through committee and on the floor for action.

I urge all of my colleagues to lend their support to the four bills in an effort to weaken, if not eliminate, the growing threat posed by international terrorism.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GET TOUGH WITH LIBYANS

Britain has rightfully decided to end diplomatic relations with Libya.

Last week, an occupant of the Libyan Embassy in London poked a machine gun out the window and fired on a group of protesters. A policewoman monitoring the protest was killed. Ten other people were wounded.

British police surrounded the embassy. The killer remained inside, protected from justice by diplomatic immunity. The British government could not storm the embassy, because under international law permission of Libya is required before entry to the embassy is allowed.

At the same time, the Libya government put troops around the British Embassy in Tripoli. Later, those troops were removed. The police around the Libyan Embassy in London remained.

Libyan leader Moammar Khadafy continued to refuse permission for British police to enter the embassy. The British wanted to question the occupants and look for weapons.

Some reports said that just before the deadly shots an American spy satellite picked up a message from Libya to the embassy. The message instructed the embassy staff to use force in response to the taunts from the protesters outside.

By Sunday, British diplomats in Libya will return home and Libyan diplomats in Britain are supposed to go home. The standoff will be over. Until then, however, the police will continue to surround the embassy.

When the Libyan diplomats come out of the embassy, a killer will be walking with them. It seems unfair to the family of the slain policewoman. She was protecting the Libyans and now she is dead at the hands of a Libyan.

However, we must praise Britain's decision to cut diplomatic relations. It is tough action. It may not match the crime, but it puts the radical Khadafy regime on notice.

Khadafy must be taught that the more civilized nations of the world will not tolerate his militaristic tactics. His threats must be countered with adequate protections. His actions must be reprimanded. His use of embassies to carry out intimidation of his exiles must stop. His lawlessness must end or at least be confined within the borders of Libya.

Our prayers go to the 8,000 British citizens living in Libya. We hope that they will be unharmed.